REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 33-44 and 46-48 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In an Office Action dated December 28, 2006, claims 1, 4-17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 33-44 and 46-48 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 33-44 and 46-48 under 35 USC § 103(a) as follows:

- Claims 1, 4-7, 9-13, 16-17, 19, 27, 29-30, 33-36, 38-40, and 43-44 in view of Nakagawa (US 2004/0095314) and Spletzer (U.S. 6,919,909).
- Claims 8, 20, and 37 in view of Nakagawa, Spletzer, and Lechner (U.S. 5,487,665).
- Claims 14-15, 22, and 41-42 in view of Nakagawa, Spletzer, and Fisher (U.S. 5,242,306).
- Claim 25 in view of Nakagawa, Spletzer, Lechner, and Fisher.
- Claims 46 and in view of Nakagawa, Spletzer, and Dugdale (U.S. 5,707,128).
- Claim 47 in view of Nakagawa, Spletzer, Lechner, and Dugdale.

These rejections are now traversed.

Independent claims 1, 4, 9, 20, 22, 25, 29, 30, 33, 38, and 46-47, recite systems and methods for displaying images with multiple projectors, comprising, *inter alia*, workspace projector(s) project a portion of an image "comprising a blank area corresponding to the display location" of a window, "wherein no light is projected in the blank area by the workspace projector." Similarly, independent claim 27 recites a system

for displaying an image comprising, *inter alia*, "a display device, for displaying a portion of the image omitting an area corresponding to a movable window."

These aspects of the claimed invention describe area(s) into which the window projector(s) project that are left blank by the workspace projector(s) such that no light is projected in the blank areas by the workspace projector. The claims have been amended to more clearly point out these aspects.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. As the Examiner admits, Nakagawa and Spletzer do not disclose workspace projectors leaving the window area of the image completely blank. Office Action dated 12/28/2006, p. 11.

The Examiner relies on Fisher for this element, however Fisher does not remedy this deficiency of Nakagawa and Spletzer. Fisher merely discloses a simulator apparatus with a low-resolution, wide field background image projected by background projectors each projecting a single color – blue, red, and green. An inset projector superimposes onto a portion of the background image a single-color high resolution image at the area of interest. *See, e.g.,* Fisher, Abstract. When the inset projector projects a green image, the green background projector does not project into the area of the inset image but the red and blue background projectors *continue to project* into the area of the inset image. In other words, Fisher's inset projector ***superimposes*** its image on the images projected by the background projectors. Thus, the image seen in the area into which the inset projector projects is a *combination of both inset and background projectors*. *See* Fisher, Fig. 1, 2; col. 3, ll. 53-64. Therefore, Fisher does not leave the inset area ***blank*** with respect to the background projectors. Therefore, Fisher does not disclose displaying a "*portion of an image comprising a blank area corresponding to the display location*" of a window, "*wherein* ***no light is projected in the blank area*** *by the workspace projector.*"

Thus, the deficient disclosures of these references, considered either alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. A *prima facie* showing of obviousness requires (1) some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference, (2) a reasonable expectation of success, and (3) that the reference(s) teach or suggest all the claim limitations. As discussed above, the references do not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 1, 4, 9, 20, 22, 25, 27, 29, 30, 33, 38, and 46-47 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Dependent claims 5-8, 10, 24, 34-37, 39, 40, and 42-44 variously depend from independent claims 1, 4, 9, 20, 22, 25, 27, 29, 30, 33, 38, and 46-47, which were shown above to be patently distinguishable over the cited references, and thus also are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Furthermore, even assuming *arguendo* that the combination suggested by the Examiner did show these claimed elements, the Examiner's arguments lack the necessary suggestion or motivation to modify the reference(s). Specifically, one of skill in the art would not be motivated to modify Nakagawa and Spletzer to include various aspects of Fisher as suggested by the Examiner, and would not look to the art of Fisher for guidance. It is well understood in the art that the area of computer graphics processing and selective visual display systems (class 345) is entirely distinct from education and demonstration (class 434), as reflected by the different USCL classifications into which Nakagawa and Spletzer (345) and Fisher (434) are placed.

Independent claims 20, 25, and 47 are further rejected in view of Lechner in combination with Nakagawa and Spletzer and/or Fisher. Lechner does not remedy the deficiencies of the above-described references. Lechner merely discloses a visual display system that provides a means for generating one or more inset images at high resolution

that are projected ***onto*** a lower resolution background image. *See* Lechner, col. 2, ll.20-28. Thus, Lechner's image is a *combination of both the high resolution inset image and the lower resolution background image*. *See* Lechner, col. 2, ll. 29-37. Therefore, Lechner does not leave the inset area ***blank***. Thus, Lechner does not disclose displaying a "*portion of an image comprising a blank area corresponding to the display location*" of a window, "*wherein* ***no light is projected in the blank area*** *by the workspace projector.*"

Thus, the deficient disclosures of these references fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made, as the references do not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 20, 25, and 47 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Similar to Fisher, Lechner is in the education and demonstration USCL classification (class 434). Therefore, even assuming *arguendo* that the combination did show these claimed elements, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Nakagawa and Spletzer (345) with Lechner (434) for the reasons articulated above.

Independent claims 46-48 are further rejected under Dugdale in combination with Nakagawa and Spletzer and/or Lechner. Dugdale does not remedy the deficiencies of the above-described references. Dugdale merely discloses system for "projecting slewable visual images" and a method for "aligning an image projector to a display screen." *See* Dugdale, col. 1, ll. 36-38, 63-64. The target projector projects the image of the target onto the display screen over the image projected by the out the window projector. *See* Dugdale, Fig 1. Therefore, Dugdale does not disclose displaying a "*portion of an image comprising a blank area corresponding to the display location*" of a window, "*wherein* ***no light is projected in the blank area*** *by the workspace projector.*"

Additionally, the Examiner cites Dugdale for disclosing resizing the window in response to a user command as in the claimed invention. However, the portion of Dugdale cited by the Examiner, merely states that a "lens system performs the zoom and focus functions necessary for the target image to appear the proper size." *See* Dugdale, col. 3, ll. 8-10. The act of zooming changes the size of the target image by changing the scale of the image. However, the size of the field of view does not necessarily change when the target image is increased or decreased in size. For example, an image may be larger in scale but less of the total image is displayed. Therefore, Dugdale does not teach that the window is resized.

Thus, the deficient disclosures of these references thus fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made, since the references do not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 46-48 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 4-13, 15-17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 33-40, 42-44, and 46-48, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The cited references do not teach, individually or in combination, all of the limitations of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss the above amendments and remarks, or if the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' representative would help to advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,
JOHN BARRUS, KURT PIERSOL AND
STEPHEN SAVITZKY

Dated: April 30, 2007

By: /Jennifer R. Bush/
Jennifer R. Bush, Reg. No. 50,784
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94306
Phone: (650) 335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200